



# INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF HIGH SCHOOLS

C. Selvi Jeya Ruby<sup>1</sup> | Dr. D. Sivakumar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ph.D. Scholar, Bharathiyar University, Coimbatore.

<sup>2</sup> Principal, C. K. College of Education, Cudaloor.

## ABSTRACT

The main aim of the study was to find out the significant difference between institutional development of high schools. Survey method was adopted for this study. The sample consists of 150 high schools in Thoothukudi and Tirunelveli districts. Simple Random Sampling Technique was used. Questionnaire for Assessment of Institutional Development (2017) was developed by the investigator used to collect the data. The statistical technique used was mean, standard deviation and 't' test. The findings of the study were: i) There is significant difference among below 5 years, 5 to 10 years and above 10 years establishment of high schools in their resource development, social development and institutional development. ii) There is significant difference among government, government aided and private high schools in their faculty development, financial development and institutional development. The educational implications and suggestions for further study are also given as per the findings of the study.

**KEYWORDS:** Institutional Development, High Schools.

## INTRODUCTION:

A school is an institution designed to provide learning spaces and learning environments for the teaching of students (or "pupils") under the direction of teachers. Most countries have systems of formal education, which is commonly compulsory. In these systems, students progress through a series of schools. An institution to provide necessary support to students facilitating good campus experiences and their holistic development. It also seeks information on student and alumni profiles and their contributions to the institution and vice-versa. The focus of this criterion is captured in the following criterion statements that spell out some of the good practices expected of a quality institution: The institution has adequate learning resources and a well-established mechanism to systematically review the various library resources for adequate access and relevance and to make acquisition decisions. The various provisions in the institution support and enhance the effectiveness of the faculty in teaching and mentoring of students. The campus environment promotes motivation, satisfaction, development and performance improvement of students. The progress of the students at different stages of the programmes is monitored and the students are appropriately advised. The institution develops the leadership qualities of the students through their participation and involvement in various institutional activities.

## NEED FOR THE STUDY:

Nowadays the rule rather than the exception for overseas aid projects in the water and environmental sectors to include institutional development as a significant, if not the main, component. Yet institutional development is not a particularly well-defined activity it being a combination of managerial, technical, organizational and behavioural techniques. Furthermore, the basic concepts in some of these fields are still in the evolutionary stages. Recent years have seen a remarkable and exciting revival of interest in the empirical analysis of how a broad set of institutions growth. The focus of the recent outpouring of research is on exploiting cross-country variation in institutional quality to identify whether a causal runs from institutions to growth. Hence the investigator has taken up this present study for investigation.

## Operational Definitions of the Key Terms:

- Institutional Development:** Institutional Development (ID) is the creation or reinforcement of the capacity of an organization to generate, allocate and use human and financial resources effectively to attain development objectives, public or private. It includes not only the building and strengthening of institutions but also their retrench.
- High Schools:** It refers to the high schools up to X standard in Thoothukudi and Tirunelveli districts.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY:

- To find out the significant difference among below 5 years, 5 to 10 years and above 10 years establishment of high schools in their faculty development, resource development, financial development, social development, communication development and institutional development.
- To find out the significant difference among government, government aided and private high schools in their faculty development, resource development, financial development, social development, communication develop-

ment and institutional development.

## NULL HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY:

- There is no significant difference among below 5 years, 5 to 10 years and above 10 years establishment of high schools in their faculty development, resource development, financial development, social development, communication development and institutional development.
- There is no significant difference among government, government aided and private high schools in their faculty development, resource development, financial development, social development, communication development and institutional development.

## METHODOLOGY:

The researcher adopted the survey method to study the institutional development of high schools.

## Population and Sample:

The population for the present study consisted of the high schools in Thoothukudi and Tirunelveli districts. 150 high schools were taken for this investigation. They were selected randomly from each school.

## Tool use for the Study:

The investigator has used self made tool. Questionnaire for Assessment of Institutional Development (2017).

## Statistical Techniques Applied:

The statistical applications mean, Standard deviation and 't' test was applied for the study.

## Delimitations of the study:

- The study is conducted in high schools only.
- The area chosen for conducting the study was only at Thoothukudi and Tirunelveli districts.

## Data Analysis and Findings of the Study

### Null Hypothesis 1:

**Table 1: Difference Among Below 5 Years, 5 To 10 Years and Above 10 Years Establishment of High Schools in their Institutional Development**

Dimensions	Source	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean square variance	Calculated 'F' value	Remarks
Faculty Development	Between	1.206	2	.603	0.126	NS
	Within	706.127	147	4.804		
Resource Development	Between	40.424	2	20.212	4.656	S
	Within	638.169	147	4.341		
Financial Development	Between	26.012	2	13.006	3.023	NS
	Within	632.361	147	4.302		

Dimensions	Source	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean square variance	Calculated 'F' value	Remarks
Social Development	Between	19.869	2	9.935	1.627	S
	Within	897.464	147	6.105		
Communication Development	Between	1.124	2	.562	0.289	NS
	Within	285.836	147	1.944		
Institutional Development	Between	139.254	2	69.627	3.611	S
	Within	2834.620	147	19.283		

[For (2, 147) degrees of freedom at 5 % level of significance, the table value 'F' is 3.06]

It is inferred from the above table that there is no significant difference among below 5 years, 5 to 10 years and above 10 years establishment of high schools in their faculty development, financial development and communication development. But there is significant difference among below 5 years, 5 to 10 years and above 10 years high schools in their resource development, social development and institutional development. While comparing the mean scores of below 5 years, 5 to 10 years and above 10 years establishment of high schools, 5 to 10 years establishment of high schools mean value (43.71, 44.71) is higher than below 5 years (42.41, 44.37) and above 10 years (43.40, 43.43) in their facilities resource development, social development and institutional development.

#### Null Hypothesis 2:

**Table 2: Difference Among Government, Government Aided and Private High Schools in their Institutional Development**

Dimensions	Source	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean square variance	Calculated 'F' value	Remarks
Faculty Development	Between	31.637	2	15.818	3.441	S
	Within	675.697	147	4.597		
Resource Development	Between	1.292	2	.646	0.140	NS
	Within	677.302	147	4.607		
Financial Development	Between	39.341	2	19.671	4.671	S
	Within	619.032	147	4.211		
Social Development	Between	23.000	2	11.500	1.890	NS
	Within	894.334	147	6.084		
Communication Development	Between	4.273	2	2.137	1.111	NS
	Within	282.687	147	1.923		
Institutional Development	Between	187.252	2	93.626	4.939	S
	Within	2786.621	147	18.957		

[For (2, 147) degrees of freedom at 5 % level of significance, the table value 'F' is 3.06]

It is inferred from the above table that there is no significant difference among government, government aided and private high schools in their resource development, social development and communication development. But there is significant difference among government, government aided and private high schools in their faculty development, financial development and institutional development. While comparing the mean score of government, government aided and private high schools, government high schools mean value (52.72, 44.03, 242.42) is higher than government aided (51.79, 42.73, 239.81) and private (52.73, 42.35, 241.73) high schools mean value in their faculty development, financial development and institutional development.

#### Educational Implications:

1. Institutions should organize seminar, workshop, conferences and refresher courses for the development of faculty.
2. The high schools can develop communication technologies for their administration.
3. High schools should develop their financial status for running school.
4. Schools should participate in the development of society.
5. High schools should develop their resources for teacher and student welfare.
6. High schools should maintain their environment properly.

#### Suggestions for Further Research:

The following are the suggestions for further research studies.

1. A similar study may be undertaken for colleges, higher secondary schools

and colleges of education.

2. This study can be extended to university and technical colleges.
3. The sample is taken from Thoothukudi and Tirunelveli districts only. It can be extended to other districts.
4. Some more dimensions were included in institutional Development and can be taken into account for further investigation.

#### CONCLUSION:

The institution ensures participation of the students in various curricular, extra-curricular and co-curricular activities, which can provide learning opportunities leading to students' intellectual, social and personal development. Through the various activities on and off the campus the institution encourages positive social interaction and self-motivation fostering the holistic development of the student. The institution has a well established functional organizational structure and governance system for planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating the administrative and academic provisions of the institution.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Anand, C.L., (1976). Social Structure and Processes in a High School in South India. Indian Educational Review, Vol. II, January.
2. Bareh, Hamlet, (1996). Progress of Education in Meghalaya. Delhi: Mehra Offset Press.1996.
3. Basu. B.D., (1999). History of Education in India. Delhi: Cosmo Publication.
4. Thanavathi, C. (2012). Teacher Education. Thoothukudi: Perumal Publications.
5. Thanavathi, C. (2017). Advanced Research and Statistics. Salem: Samyuktha Publications.
6. Thanavathi, C. (2017). Curriculum Design and Development. Salem: Samyuktha Publications.